

09/437,560

MS28076.2

REMARKS

Claims 14-22 and 26-48 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. All pending claims are found at pages 2-12. Claims 22, 32, 33 and 37 have been amended herein for clarification purposes. New claims 38-48 have been added herein to emphasize various novel aspects of the subject invention. These claims do not raise any new issues requiring additional search and/or undue consideration over that of the originally filed claims. Accordingly, entry and consideration thereof is respectfully requested, and further, favorable consideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Rejection of Claim 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claim 22 is herein amended to cure such informalities and accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejection of Claims 14-22 and 26-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 14-22 and 26-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Peterson *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,801,687). It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Peterson *et al.* does not disclose, teach nor suggest, each and every element of the subject claim.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).